

Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
April 7, 2006

Participants		
Cara Clore	Michigan Recycling Coalition and Clinton County	clorec@clinton-county.org
Michael Csapo	Resource Recovery and Recycling Authority of Southwest Oakland County (RRRASOC)	RRRASOC@aol.com
Steve Essling	Michigan Waste Industry Association (MWIA)- Waste Management	sessling@wm.com
Don Pyle	Delta Solid Waste Management Authority/Upper Peninsula Recycling Coalition (UPRC)	dswma@dsnet.us
Patty O'Donnell	Northwest MI Council of Governments	podonnel@nwm.cog.mi.us
Jim Frey	Resource Recovery Systems (RRS)	frey@recycle.com
Tom Horton	Waste Management/MWIA	thorton@wm.com
Tom Frazier	Michigan Townships Association	tom@michigantownships.org
Susan Johnson	Butzel Long	johnsons@butzel.com
Paul Zugger	Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC)	pzugger@pscinc.com

DEQ Staff		
Frank Ruswick	DEQ-Executive Division	ruswickf@michigan.gov
Lucy Doroshko	DEQ-ESSD	doroshkl@michigan.gov
George Bruchmann	DEQ-WHMD	bruchmag@michigan.gov
Matt Flechter	DEQ-WHMD	flechtem@michigan.gov
Steve Sliver	DEQ-WHMD	slivers@michigan.gov
Rhonda Oyer Zimmerman	DEQ-WHMD	oyerr@michigan.gov
Noelle Hartner	DEQ-WHMD	hartnern@michigan.gov
Liane Shekter Smith	DEQ-WHMD	shekterl@michigan.gov
Marcia Horan	DEQ-ESSD	horanm@michigan.gov
Jim Sygo	DEQ- Executive Division	sygoj@michigan.gov

Handouts

- Agenda
- Michigan Solid Waste Policy Discussion Items 3-24-06
- March 24, 2006 Meeting Summary
- Policy Statement Flow Charts A-G

- Municipal Solid Waste Fact Sheet

Introductions and notes from previous meeting

- Notes from March 24, 2006 meeting approved for posting on web site.

Explanation of DEQ's Process for Development of Tier 4 Policy Statements

- DEQ staff used Assumption/Question format and feedback from previous meeting to turn discussion into 4th tier policy statements.
- DEQ tried to capture every idea from the Assumption/Question discussion.
- The updated flow chart may not be perfectly linear since there are some common items that may be translated across the 3rd tier boxes, but the ideas were captured somewhere in the statements.
- DEQ staff got approximately half of the way through and will continue working on the remaining discussion items to incorporate them into 4th tier policy statements this week.
- Arrows are used for visuals and will eventually be deleted and turned into straight 4th tier policy statements.
- The 4th tier is as far as this policy will be going. No additional tiers or detail will be added.

Committee Review of Tier 4 Policy Statements

- Goal of today's meeting is to go through each of the policy statements one box at a time, ground-truthing each statement to see what sort of agreement the Committee has on 4th level policy statements.
- At the next meeting, we will go through the second half of the statements and at that point, we should have a package put together that people who have not been involved in the process can follow.
- The draft will be submitted to the DEQ Environmental Advisory Council at their May meeting and come back to this Committee with any comments on it and to polish it up.
- There is a possibility that the Committee will meet in late May or early June to finish up, but it is not yet certain.
- We will need to put words and narrative into the document to make it free standing.
- In general, there will be much more substance in policy statements than explanatory text (75% substance, 25% narrative wrapping of statements).
- Document will likely be brief and to the point.

Committee Comments

Policy Statement Flow Chart A

To reduce waste generation, Michigan should:

A.

- The entire section does not capture intensity of what we need, not robust enough for what department is trying to do. Need to drive Pollution Prevention concepts in all DEQ programs.

- Provide specific examples of techniques that could be utilized
- Keep in mind that concepts may be found in other categories- staff looked at issues one by one (reductionism).
- Need different term for “recognition systems”

A: Provide incentives to change behavior to reduce waste generation.

- Include examples after this statement.

B.

- Behaviors incorporated into Michigan practices- technical assistance.
- Integrate regional and national issues
- “Collaborate” rather than “participate”
- Capture effort to use resources more wisely- adopt best practices
- To what extent should we explain why we are doing something?

B: Collaborate with regional and national efforts to encourage product design to produce less waste.

C.

- Share technologies
- R & D and development is redundant- Use commercialize, share or disseminate instead.

C: Encourage R & D to disseminate, share, and commercialize technologies and practices that generate less waste.

D.

- Too narrow- want technical assistance
- Citizens = everyone (will need to explain this in narrative or glossary)
- Need to say more than citizen- corporations are not citizens, people are.
- It is more than just providing information
- Barriers and benefits in using information are not stated

D: Provide information to citizens, businesses, governments, and other organizations on why and how to reduce waste generation.

- Is waste avoidance inherent in pollution prevention?
- Driving pollution prevention concepts is talking about incentives.
- Disincentive related to waste generation (ex. Paying for creating waste)
- Pollution prevention should be mentioned somewhere- reduce waste at the source concept through different technologies and approaches.
- Reduce waste generation through pollution prevention.
- Add “and” statement: “To reduce waste generation and encourage pollution prevention, Michigan should...”
- Brand recognition- recognize strategies used through ESSD
- May need to add pollution prevention in Tier 2

- In examples listed under A, pollution prevention initiatives could be mentioned, and P2 goals integrated into regulatory processes, which is an example of an incentive system (explained in A)
- *Before next meeting, send any examples you may have to DEQ staff (Level of detail can be addressed through the examples.)

To encourage more waste diversion, Michigan should:

A.

- 40% recycling rate is in governor's current policy
- Put a year in to clarify what waste stream
- Difficult because no data is collected
- Unknown if 40% is already being diverted since we do not have data.
- 2010 is only 4 years away, may want to strive for 50% by 2015
- 50% diversion of whatever is being generated

A: Divert 50% of the generated waste stream by 2015.

B.

- List barriers in narrative
- Talk about examples
- Inconsistencies and regulatory barriers
- Inconsistent with statutes

B: Identify and remedy regulatory inconsistencies and barriers to waste diversion.

C.

- 2015 is more consistent with above
- 2015 is too far off
- Comfortable because have to have diversion in place first (2012)
- Banning burn barrels does not fit in this box
- Does convenient capture affordable?
- Affordable is different depending on location
- Backyard burning and on site disposal- where and how does it fit?

C: Ensure all Michigan citizens have convenient access to residential recycling programs by 2012.

D.

- Collaborate instead of participate

D: Collaborate in regional and national efforts to encourage manufacturing and distribution systems to facilitate waste diversion.

E.

- Leave as is

E: Support the development of markets for recycled materials.

F.

- Changes parallel with A

F: Provide information and technical assistance to citizens and businesses on why and how to divert waste.

G.

- Move up to a higher tier
- Packaging issue that DEQ staff will review

G: Have a state government that leads by example.

H.

- May be a Tier 2 statement
- Recognize all benefits/costs
- Will people know what we mean? Provide explanation of what we mean
- Modify Policy Statement 1 in Tier 2
- Take into account or weigh- do something with it
- DEQ will word smith
- Should be separate box altogether in Tier 2
- Use “utilize” rather than “divert” in Tier 2 statement- DEQ will see if this works.

H: Recognize all benefits and costs when making solid waste management choices.

Policy Statement Flow Chart B

To provide more solid waste diversion capacity, Michigan should:

- Who are citizens?
- Add phrase to explain
- Glossary to define terms
- *Send terms to DEQ that you think should be defined in glossary

A.

- Use “employ” instead of “utilize”

A: Use partnerships to utilize the individual strengths of the public and private sectors.

B.

- Inconsistencies issue again

B: Identify and remedy regulatory inconsistencies and barriers to the development of waste diversion infrastructure.

C.

- Dislike Michigan Markets phrase
- Implies deficiencies because of a lack of markets but other factors also impede.

- Broader than markets
- Develop within Michigan that capacity
- Market based solutions
- Regional concept later
- Incorporate market portion into D.

C: Identify local and statewide deficiencies in waste diversion capacity and promote the development of infrastructure and Michigan markets to meet those needs.

D.

- Delete “find ways to”
- Generic statement

D: Take advantage of the economic opportunities that come from viewing waste as a resource in a regional setting.

E.

- Provide examples in policy
- Delete “groups of” and “in order”

E: Encourage coordinated action by communities or industries in researching, developing, and sharing technologies to take advantage of economies of scale and utilize their unique contributions.

To ensure appropriate disposal capacity, Michigan should:

A.

- There is a role in regulating out of state waste
- Creates excess capacity that has market effect- ensure capacity without cost/unwanted consequence of attracting out of state waste but recognize waste as commodity
- Tie all together
- Current legal mechanism needs to be adjusted (county plans)
- Use “adjust” instead of “develop”
- Use “in light of...” statement as narrative- detracts from clarity of statement and is a qualifier
- If status changes, this would be obsolete
- Limited by fact that waste is an article of commerce
- May go in another box
- Legal mechanisms are available and have not been put in place.
- Unnecessary to say since whatever we do has to be legal
- Disposal capacity is a result of planning process- specific mechanism allowing it to occur (siting mechanisms)
- Mandate resource recovery instead of siting mechanisms
- Adequate not excessive capacity
- Take Michigan’s needs into account
- Need explanatory text here
- Prescriptive with word “legal”

A: Develop mechanisms to ensure adequate yet not excessive disposal capacity to meet Michigan's needs without creating a system that attracts out of state waste.

- Add bullet points of siting mechanisms, article of commerce, etc.
- Agreements are also mechanisms

B.

- And increases environmental benefits (ex. Bioreactors, methane)
- Implies sanctioning of current activities.
- Add "potential for"

B: Encourage the continual development of technology and practices that reduce the potential for environmental harm from waste disposal.

C.

- Add "local disposal capacity"
- Do away with acronym

C: Recognize that local units of government are in the best position to determine how to provide appropriate local disposal capacity.

Policy Statement Flow Chart C

Michigan should improve its ability to manage solid waste by advocating for greater authority to manage imported waste.

- Other jurisdictions is other states and countries
- Leadership should advocate for establishment of these things- advocacy may not belong here.
- Michigan speaks to variety of actors, but this statement focuses on political leaders.
- Specify who jurisdictions are
- Concern over government controlling article of commerce
- Does not flow from C
- May be 2 separate points- packaging issue
- Does not say what government is going to do/recognizes limitation
- Wasteshed/regional basis
- Came from broader concept that talks about regional system
- Recognizing limitations of regional economy
- Can be fixed through other means that we've already addressed
- Be careful about reading too far into what this says.
- Need to work with Congress to improve ability to manage solid waste
- Disparity on issue— come back to at a later date
- Need to address it at some level- most people think of solid waste issue as Canadian waste and will have to mention it somewhere in policy or policy will be misunderstood.
- Goes beyond solid waste policy- ramifications are huge

- DEQ will develop explanatory text for what this means.
- Bottom box does not flow from top box
- Address issue of import restrictions in terms of broader economic impacts.

Policy Statement Flow Chart D

To encourage choices consistent with the management preferences, Michigan should:

A.

- Use “provide” instead of “help”
- More than one way to get useful information than just through the state.
- Facilitate access to – state not always provider
- Consequences to benefits- also costs

A: Facilitate access to accurate and easy to use info about the consequences of alternative choices.

B.

- Redundant- delete
- Helps people understand what we are talking about
- Leave for now – add clarity to avoid redundancy
- Focus on educational aspects- adjust as we go forward

B: Develop and promote incentive systems to increase participation in waste diversion programs.

C.

- Is there a place for tools (i.e. deposits, disposal bans), and where/when to use?
- Encourages illegal disposal at some level (ex. Lead acid batteries, tires, mercury)
- Encourage includes regulatory measures
- Revisiting series of concepts
- Placement
- Product bans- do not create products to begin with
- Exhaustive in listing products that contain materials – law and market always reacting to one another
- Question of role of product ban in solid waste policy- normally a public health issue/ban

C: Consider a disposal ban for a material that presents significant and avoidable harm if the ban would not result in an unacceptable increase in illegal disposal.

D.

- C & D waste example- drive behavior by banning
- Delete “little environmental risk”- this is covered in other places

- Product bans have 2 classes of materials (yard wastes/cardboard and lead acid batteries)
- Corporations' policies (ex. Car manufacturers)
- This statement considers a ban, does not in itself ban
- Supports current programs
- Is a tool

D: consider a disposal ban for large volume, easily recycled material that has high resource potential provided there is a well developed market and collection infrastructure.

E.

- Add "effective"
- Examples are Bottle Bill, battery deposit
- If it provides environmental benefit

E: Consider a deposit system for a high risk or large volume product if it would create an efficient, effective, and equitable collection and diversion infrastructure.

F.

- Ok as is

F: Facilitate waste diversion in recreational and other public settings.

G.

- Add students under item (e)
- Under item (b), Add "development potential"- economic development issue addressed here, not cost/benefit analysis
- What about economic costs? Addressed in another box in Tier 2
- More detail in this section than in A
- How about regional levels?
- Streamlined efforts
- Consideration of regional efforts
- May add an item (g) below to address community-based social marketing- tailor messages to key audiences, create a brand to deliver messages in different localities.
- *DEQ will work on statement for next meeting.
- *g: Use community-based marketing techniques to identify barriers to use of management preferences and tailor messages accordingly.

G: Expand and improve information and education programs by:

- a) Developing and making available a statewide message on waste diversion that can be appropriately tailored and presented for different audiences.**
- b) Including information on the economic development potential of waste diversion.**
- c) Using a variety of tools and media.**

- d) **Developing a means to evaluate effectiveness.**
- e) **Addressing key audiences such as local decision-makers, industry, retailers, residents, and students.**
- f) **Supporting coordinated and collaborative efforts at the local level.**

Burn Barrel Discussion

- How can we articulate this?
- Backyard burning and on-site burial- prohibit/ further limit/discourage
- Anything less than prohibit and people will continue to do it.
- Take a hard stand against it since it is a fundamental problem
- Will drive force of other solutions
- Household refuse- make sure this includes recyclables
- Problem with outright prohibition- puts demand on local units of government to come up with an alternative in tight budget times
- Add a date (by 2015)- this gives opportunity to plan on ban coming and phase it in
- No reason to burn- everyone has somewhere they can take it
- Inconsistent not to ban it since we know its environmentally unsound and this is a solid waste policy
- Use same concept as yard waste ban (bans by X date)
- DEQ should set date, not Committee
- Committee picked dates in 2 other places in policy
- Suggested date = 2012 for ban on burning waste so markets are in place
- Bad practice to burn- this is a Solid Waste Policy and should be included as a recommendation. The legislature/Governor can change
- Recognizing other interests by phasing in – date may or may not fly
- Date boxes DEQ in without knowing enough to set date
- Tell them to figure out a date
- “Within an implementable time frame” – this takes all factors into consideration.
- Political decisions- not DEQ policy
- Add as item (h) under Policy Flow Chart D
- h: Prohibit within an implementable time frame the burning of household refuse.

Next Steps

- DEQ will work on the remaining six 4th tier Policy Statements that they did not get to last time.
- DEQ will work on word-smithing and language issues discussed today.
- Draft will be sent out to committee prior to April 21, 2006 meeting.
- Next Meeting: April 21, 2006

** Denotes further action is necessary.*